

REMARKS

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the withdrawal of the restriction requirement made in the prior office action of June 24, 2008. Upon entry of the present Amendment, claims 1 –20 will be pending in the application.

Claims 1 -19 have been amended. Claim 20 has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Amendments to, cancellation of, and additions to, the claims, as set forth above, are made in order to streamline prosecution in this case by limiting examination and argument to certain claimed embodiments that presently are considered to be of immediate commercial significance. Amendment or cancellation of the claims is not in any manner intended to, and should not be construed to, waive Applicants' right in the future to seek such unamended or cancelled subject matter, or similar matter (whether in equivalent, broader, or narrower form) in the present application, and any continuation, divisional, continuation-in-part, RCE, or any other application claiming priority to or through the present application, nor in any manner to indicate an intention, expressed or implied, to surrender any equivalent to the claims as pending after such amendments or cancellations.

Provisional Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 - 19 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over copending Application no. 10/549,624 and over copending Application no. 10/486,893.

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the possibility that claims in the cited application or the present application will be further amended before allowance, response to this provisional rejection will be deferred until claims in the reference application are allowed, claims in the present application are otherwise allowable, and it is determined whether this provisional

rejection becomes an actual rejection.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-19 have been objected to because the claims include reference numbers of a figure of an apparatus. In addition, claim 1 was objected to as the recitation of “having” in claim 1 was indicated to be redundant.

In response, the reference numerals in each of the claims has been deleted and the occurrences of “having” in claim 1 have been removed. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to address the rejections, and it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 has now been addressed. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC 103

Claims 1 -19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Moritz.

The office action indicated that Moritz discloses all of the basic essential features of claim 1, and that other non-disclosed features are considered non-essential. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Amended independent claim 1 recites that the cross section of the reaction volume initially increases at least over part of a length of the rotor in an area adjacent the inlet and the cross section of the reaction volume does not increase at least over part of the length of the rotor in an area adjacent the outlet. Moritz neither teaches nor suggests this recitation of amended independent claim 1.

Indeed, the disclosure of the present application cites and distinguishes Moritz (identified as DE 198 28 742 A1), at page 4, line 11 to page 5, line 19. Therein, Applicants note that the

Taylor reactor of Moritz is unable to solve the problems which occur in the course of bulk polymerization, specifically, it is not possible to increase the monomer conversion to an extent such that substantial freedom from monomers and a narrow molecular weight distribution and molecular weight polydispersity of the polymers are achieved.

In contrast, the geometry recited in claim 1 of the present invention solves the problem occurring during bulk polymerization wherein an adverse reaction regime may result in considerable quantities of residual monomers, which must then be discharged from the Taylor reactor. Without the proper geometry, there may also be instances of coagulation and polymer deposition, which in some cases may even lead to blockage of the reactor or of the product outlet. With the claimed invention, it is possible to obtain the desired products, as for instance polymers having comparatively narrow molar mass distribution.

Claims 2-19 are dependent upon claim 1 and are allowable for the reasons set forth above in response to the rejection of claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claim

It is respectfully submitted that new claim 20 is also allowable. Allowance is requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant(s) respectfully submit that the Application and pending claims 1 -20 are patentable in view of the foregoing amendments and/or remarks. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. As always, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the Undersigned by telephone if direct conversation would be helpful.

Respectfully submitted,

/MaryEGolota/
Mary E. Golota
Reg. No. 36,814
Cantor Colburn, LLP
(248) 524-2300

February 13, 2009

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS ONLY

BASF Corporation
1609 Biddle Avenue
Wyandotte, MI 48192
Customer No. 26922

MEG/SMB